

PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	Fi	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,290	09/994,290 11/26/2001		Donald L. Schilling	I-2-56.4US	9587
24374	7590	08/11/2005		EXAM	IINER
VOLPE AN	D KOE	NIG, P.C.		JONES, PI	RENELL P
DEPT. ICC		•			
UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET				2667	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		(X
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/994,290	SCHILLING, DONALD L.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Prenell P. Jones	2667
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	 .136(a). In no event, however, may a a post of third the statutory minimum of third d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON the, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		· ·
1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/2 2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☒ Th 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matt	·
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdres 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	ccepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyar ction is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
•		
Attachment(s)	•	
1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ☑ Checks	Paper No(s	ummary (PTÖ-413))/Mail Date uformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/994,290 Page 2

Art Unit: 2667

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-17 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,465 and claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 of US Patent No. 5,610,906. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference between claim 1 of the current Application and claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,465 and 1, 2, 3 and 5 of US Patent No. 5,610,906 is that the limitation, "a product device for mixing the combined signal with a chipping sequence, and the antenna for transmitting the mixed

combined signal at a second frequency" of claim 1 of the present application is encompassed by the combination of the limitations "plurality of chipping sequences", "mixer for de-spreading base spread spectrum", and "product device for de-spreading spread spectrum", which are associated with claims 1, 2, 3 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,465 and 1, 2, 3 and 5 of US Patent No. 5,610,906. It has been held that the omission an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd.App.1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art. Claims 2-17 depend on claim 1, so claims 2-17 are rejected as well.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prenell P. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-3180. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on 571-272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prenell P. Jones

August 5, 2005

CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE